

about passing that legislation in a bipartisan fashion. The 9/11 Commission report has now been on our desks for many weeks now.

Can the leader inform us of where that legislation currently stands?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. The committees have been working, and many committees have been working in a bipartisan way. I think a bill will be introduced in the next day or two, possibly tomorrow; and the committees have been instructed to mark up that bill, and I think that bill covers 12 different committees. Next week, and we hope to have the final product ready to come to the floor either by the end of next week or the following.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information.

I have not talked to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) or the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and I see the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is on the floor, about the substance of the proposal; but I will certainly discuss it with them. I hope they have been included in these deliberations of a bill that may be introduced because if they have, I think it would make it easier for us to get it passed in a bipartisan fashion in a very efficient and speedy way.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further inquiries as to the schedule, and I appreciate the leader's engaging in somewhat the colloquy about the transportation bill, which we feel very keenly about. I hope that we can speed that bill as quickly as possible. I thank the leader for his comments.

**HOURLY MEETING ON FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2004, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2004, TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2004**

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. tomorrow; and, further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 on Tuesday, September 28, 2004, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

**DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT**

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 795) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 795

*Resolved*, That the following Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Financial Services: Mr. Gerlach.

Committee on Government Reform: Mr. Burgess.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1501

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1501.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 23, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker of the House,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have had the great privilege and honor of representing the people of the 14th Congressional District of Florida through eight elections. My service in the U.S. Congress has been a truly rewarding experience, and I thank my constituents for putting their trust and faith in me. The relationships I have developed over the years in the House will be ones I will treasure as I move to a new stage in my career.

Tomorrow I will be sworn in by the President of the United States as Director of Central Intelligence. It will definitely be a challenging job and I look forward to continue to working with you on the Intelligence issues facing our country.

Effective close of business today, September 23, 2004, I will resign my seat as the Representative of the 14th district of Florida in the U.S. House of Representatives. I have written to the Governor of Florida to advise him of my decision.

Kindest regards,

PORTER GOSS,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 23, 2004.

Hon. JEB BUSH,  
Governor, State of Florida,  
The Capitol, Tallahassee, FL.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I have had the great privilege and honor of representing the people of the 14th Congressional District of Florida through eight elections. My service in the U.S. Congress has been a truly rewarding experience, and I thank my constituents for putting their trust and faith in me. The relationships I have developed over the years serving Florida will be ones I will treasure as I move to a new stage in my career.

Tomorrow I will be sworn in by the President of the United States as Director of Central Intelligence. It will definitely be a challenge and I am truly honored the President has faith in me to do the job.

Please accept this letter as my resignation from the office of Representative of the 14th District of Florida to be effective close of business today, September 23, 2004. At the time of my resignation, the Clerk of the House will take over the offices of the 14th Congressional District. The Clerk will retain my staff so the constituents will continue to be served until the end of my term.

Kindest regards,

PORTER GOSS,  
Member of Congress.

□ 1945

#### APPOINT HOUSE DEFENSE CONFEREES

(Mr. SKELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a concern, it is a deep concern, dealing with the conference between the House and the Senate on the defense bill. You see, immediately upon passage of the bill in the Senate, the conferees were appointed. We passed our bill here in the House a good number of months ago, and, as of yet, we have had no official conferees appointed to meet with the Senate.

Despite that, we are holding informal panel discussions with the Senate trying to resolve a number of issues, but it would certainly help for us to be legal and have the conferees appointed so we can stand in the shoes of the House of Representatives properly.

I have had no explanation from anyone regarding this. It is something I do not understand, and I am not by myself. Others do not understand it.

I would like very much for the appointment of the conferees to come just as quick as possible, so we can officially act and officially make decisions on behalf of the House regarding national security.

#### STICKING IT TO WORKING FAMILIES

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the columnist Tom Oliphant wrote yesterday in the Boston Globe a column entitled

"Sticking It to Working Families," which is exactly what the All American Tax Relief Act, which was just past in this House, has done.

Why do I say that? That is because what both the White House and the Republican House leadership refused to do was to reduce the income threshold for the child tax credit to \$10,000. That level has gone up to \$11,000. It means that people who are making \$10,000 a year will no longer be eligible for a child tax credit. That is 4.3 million families. It is 9 million children who will be denied the child tax credit. These are working families.

The House Republican leadership has said this is a welfare program. That is the kind of disdain that they show for working families.

What is going to happen to these families is their taxes, yes, are going to increase, all under the guise of an All American Tax Relief Act. It is wrong. These families, these children, deserve better. That is what this House should be about.

#### HELPING AMERICAN FAMILIES

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats' Partnership for a New America is a lot about helping American families. There is no better way to help working American families than to support them as they struggle to balance work and family life, because workers need help addressing how to be both a good parent and a good employee, how to give their family the time they need without compromising their job or their career.

The Partnership with America will improve the lives of working families by encouraging debate on legislation like the Balancing Act. This Balancing Act will provide paid family leave for new parents, improve the quality and availability of child care, in-school nutrition programs, after school assistance, fund voluntary universal preschool and assist employers in establishing a family-friendly workplace.

I urge my colleagues to join me in addressing the needs of all families, thus having a true partnership with Americans.

#### NEED TO WORK IN A BIPARTISAN MANNER

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what a better day it would be if we could work in a bipartisan manner. We just debated a tax bill that could have been made much better for our constituents across this Nation.

I believe in giving some relief to middle-class and working Americans, and in fact, included in this tax bill was the

child tax credit, but, more importantly, to extend and to help with poor children in terms of the refundability of a child credit that so many working families need.

This is an ugly bill from the perspective of increasing tax relief for those who do not need it, but I could not overlook the importance of helping our military families and particularly those men and women in combat to get the kind of relief on their earned income tax. We do it only for 2 years, unfortunately. The Democrats, we wanted more, 5 years.

But it is a start. Today we did not make tax cuts permanent. I hope we will not see another tax bill that does not treat working men and women more fair and the middle-class more fair and responds to the economic needs of this country. I do think, however, we needed more dollars for research, and this does so.

But it is ugly when we do not work together. This is an ugly tax bill, but it gives some relief to middle-class Americans.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### SMART SECURITY AND ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water bravely stood up to the Bush White House by reducing, or flat out rejecting all of the administration's requests for nuclear weapons funding in its fiscal year 2005 appropriations bill. This subcommittee's move, under the sensible leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) is one of the only bipartisan instances of Members of Congress standing up to the heavy-handed Bush administration since this President took office in January of 2001.

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water wisely rejected White House requests of nearly \$70 million for research and development of new nuclear weapons. Specifically, the White House requested \$28 million for research on the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, otherwise known as the Bunker Buster;

\$30 million for planning a modern pit facility to produce new plutonium triggers; and \$9 million for a new nuclear weapons initiative.

Moreover, the new energy and water appropriations bill in its current form would reduce the administration's request for the Cruise Missile warhead by \$40 million and limit funds for all nuclear stockpile activities. In total, the subcommittee's changes would save American taxpayers over \$150 million.

The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) said the Bush administration's requests, quoting the chairman here, "were technically questionable and frankly unnecessarily provocative in the international arena." He went on to say, "They also cost a bunch of money." "Unnecessarily provocative" are the key words here.

Despite the unnecessarily provocative nature of these requests for new nuclear weapons, the Bush administration is trying to force the funding through anyway.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham outlined their concerns about the lack of funding for new nuclear weapons in a recent letter to the Republican House leadership in an attempt to dismiss entirely the tried and true appropriations process. Of course, they did not send this letter to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) or his counterpart, Senator PETE DOMENICI, unless the letters got lost in the mail. To me, it seems like the Bush administration is up to its usual tricks.

Mr. Speaker, this White House has demonstrated nothing but callous disregard for the Congress and the congressional process. President Bush and his cohorts have given no pause when it comes to freezing out anyone who will not toe the line on their fiscally unsound, budget-busting spending plans.

When it comes to nuclear weapons in particular, President Bush just does not get it. Instead of investing in programs that will truly secure America, like nonproliferation initiatives and vigorous inspection regimes whenever possible, President Bush has spent America's money on more and bigger weapons, in an attempt, I believe, to be tough and also to avoid working with other nations.

Sometimes it seems like the Oval Office is run by a third grade bully. How many nuclear weapons can the United States possibly need? We already possess 9,000 strategic warheads. Do we really need to spend another \$150 million to develop new weapons systems?

Mr. Speaker, there has to be a better way, because investing in new nuclear weapons does not prevent America from being attacked. In fact, it encourages a nuclear attack, because such investments incite our enemies and encourage other nations, like Iran, to develop nuclear weapons of their own.

That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, a Smart Security Platform For America's future. SMART